

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Rejection of claims 1, 3-7 and 9-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knapp (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0063671 A1).

5 Applicant asserts that Knapp does not teach that the first data driver and the second data driver input the same image data into each pixel unit positioned in the third scanning band simultaneously, as remarked by the Examiner.

10 Claim 1 of the present invention specifically discloses that when the scanning lines of the third scanning band scan along a third scanning direction according to a second scanning signal, the first data driver and the second data driver would input the same image data into each pixel unit positioned in the third scanning band simultaneously.

15 Despite Knapp in paragraph [0029] of the cited reference teaches the first data driver and the second data driver could input image data into the pixels in the third scanning band at the same time, Knapp does not specify whether the image data from these two data drivers is the same or not.

20 Paragraph [0026] of the present invention also recites that when scanning the third scanning band 86, the first data driver 92 and the second data driver 94 simultaneously input the same image data to the pixel units electrically controlled by the same data line 90, i.e. the first data driver 92 and the second data driver 94 simultaneously input the same image data into the third scanning band 86. As a
25 result, whether the pixel units in the third scanning band are positioned above or below the disconnecting points, the display of the pixel units can be controlled by simultaneously supplying with the same image data from the first data driver and the second data driver.

30 Since the feature of both the first data driver and the second data driver inputting

the same image data into each pixel unit positioned in the third scanning band simultaneously is absent in the cited reference, applicant asserts that Knapp does not make obvious all of the limitations of claim 1. Reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested. As claims 3-7 and 9-14 are dependent upon claim 1,
5 applicant asserts that if claim 1 is found allowable, claims 3-7 and 9-14 should additionally be found allowable.

The driving method disclosed in claim 15 of the present invention also recites a step of inputting a same image data from the first data driver and the second data
10 driver simultaneously into each pixel unit positioned in the third scanning band via data lines.


Similar to the arguments made for claim 1, despite Knapp in paragraph [0029] teaches the first data driver and the second data driver could input image data into the
15 pixels in the third scanning band at the same time, Knapp does not specifically teach the image data of each pixel unit positioned in the third scanning band input from these two data drivers is the same.

Since Knapp never suggested a step of inputting a same image data from the first
20 data driver and the second data driver simultaneously into each pixel unit positioned in the third scanning band, applicant asserts that Knapp does not make obvious all of the limitations of claim 15 of the present invention. Reconsideration of claim 15 is respectfully requested. As claims 16-22 are dependent upon claim 15, applicant asserts that if claim 15 is found allowable, claims 16-22 should additionally be found
25 allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/605,791
Amdt. dated September 27, 2007
Reply to Office action of July 31, 2007

Sincerely yours,



Date: 09/27/2007

5 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

10

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)